UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/418,142	10/14/1999	RICARDO S. AVILA	RD-26.387	8471

7590 07/14/2004

JOHN S BEULICK
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
SUITE 2600
ST LOUIS, MO 631022740

EXAMINER	
BHATNAGAR, ANAND P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	14

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/418,142	AVILA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anand Bhatnagar	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,10,12-21,23-25,27,29-39 and 42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,10,12-21,23-25,27,29-39 and 42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/12/04 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's amendment filed on 03/12/04 (paper # 11) has been entered and made of record.

3. Applicant has canceled claims 9, 11, 26, 28, 40, and 41. Currently, claims 1-8, 10, 12-25, 27, 29-39, and 42 are pending.

4. Applicant in essence argues that the prior art of Holupka et al. (U.S. patent 6,256,529 B1), Vining (U.S. patent 5,782,762), nor Edwards (U.S. patent 5,787,889) alone or in combination do not teach the feature of a rocking/rock mode of applicant's instant invention. Examiner disagrees. Holupka discloses to update the 3D/volume images in real-time (Holupka et al. col. 4 lines 63-67) and to include the rotational angles into the volume images (Holupka et al.; fig. 10 and col. 8 lines 9-25). This updating of the volume images with the rotation angle is read as the rock mode/rocking of the applicant's invention since the images are changed/updated with the change in the rotation angles.

Further applicant argues that the rock mode is well known to someone skilled in the art to be what is described in the prior art of Cooke, Jr. et al. (U.S. patent 6,574,629 B1) which is where the images are displayed first to last and then repeated last to first. This is nowhere in the original specifications as filed. The rock mode of applicant's instant invention as described in the original specification, bottom of page 11, is "a small rotation angle can be applied to the 3D model, typically about the vertical axis and normal to the viewing vector. The rotation angle varies cyclically as the 3D model is rendered from frame to frame." Nowhere is it described that a rock mode is displaying of images from first to last and then repeated last to first. Furthermore, if the feature of rock mode is well known to one skilled in the art as admitted by the applicant in his remarks, in paper # 11, then the feature of rock mode is not patentable since well known and conventional methods are not patentable.

Examiner refers to the rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 17, 18 and 35-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Holupka et al. (U.S. patent 6,256,529 B1).

Regarding claim 1: An imaging system comprising:

Holupka et al. discloses an exam prescription subsystem which specifics the manner in which data is to be acquired (fig. 1A elements 13,14, and 16 and col. 4 lines 41-47, where the software on the computer #16 specifies how to obtain the data, i.e. 3D, orthogonal 2D, oblique2D, etc.) and a visualization subsystem responsible for controlling display of acquired images and data (fig. 1A element 16 and col. 4 lines 41-47, where the software on the computer #16 specifies how to display the data, i.e. 2D slices, 3D, etc.), wherein said visualization subsystem is configured to operate in a volume autoview mode so that during data acquisition, a real-time, incrementally updated, three-dimensional view of the data is displayed (col. 4 lines 64-67, where the images are 3D data obtained is in real time, i.e. meaning automatically being updated. These data images are obtained at incremental times from t=0 to current time t.) wherein said volume autoview mode can be performed in a rock mode wherein a rotation angle is applied to a 3D model, said rotation angle varying cyclically as the 3D model is rendered from frame to frame (fig. 10 and col. 8 lines 10-25, where two angles (θ and φ) that can vary from 0 to 360 degrees are incorporated

into the image data to take into account the rotation and this is cyclical since cosine and sine functions are cyclical in nature).

Regarding claim 2: An imaging system in further comprising a data acquisition system for acquiring scan data (fig. 1 element 14), and an operator console comprising said exam prescription subsystem and said visualization subsystem (fig. 1 elements 13-16, the operator interface, and the display unit, all these units together make up the operator console).

Regarding claim 3: An imaging system further comprising an archive subsystem for storage of imaging data (fig. 1 and col. 5 lines 60-67, where there is an image data archive incorporated in the system).

Regarding claim 6: An imaging system wherein said exam prescription subsystem acquires parameter data comprising at least one of a sequence of slice locations, slice thickness, field-of-view, scanning technique, and reconstruction algorithm (col. 5 lines 2-10 and 50-53, where 2D image slices are obtained and 3D image rendering is produced. It is inherent that the locations and thickness of each slice must be tracked so that a proper 3D image can be produced).

Regarding claim 7: An imaging system wherein said parameter is contained in a scan protocol (fig. 1 element 14 and col. 5 lines 2-5, where the data obtain is contained in the image processor card, the image processor card is read as the “scan protocol”).

Regarding claim 17: An imaging system wherein said rendering subsystem is operable in at least one of a single slice mode and a multiple slice mode (col. 5 lines 3-5, where multiple slices are obtained).

Regarding claim 18: An imaging system wherein said system utilizes at least one of computed tomograph, magnetic resonance, and ultrasound acquired data to generate an image (col. 4 lines 23-27).

Regarding claim 35: Holupka et al. discloses a method for operating a medical imaging system to generate three dimensional models while the system acquires cross-sectional data (col. 5 lines 2-8 and 49-52, where 3D images are generated from obtained 2d data while transverse and orthogonal data is obtained), said method comprising the steps of:

acquiring a first slice of data (col. 5 lines 6-10, where slices are obtained); and

generating a three dimensional model based on the first slice of data (col. 5 lines 49-52), said generating including incrementally updating a three-dimensional view of the data (Holupka et al.; col. 4 lines 64-67, where the images are obtained in real time. It is inherent that these images are constantly being updated during the procedure); and

applying a rotation angle to the model, the rotation angle varying cyclically as the model is rendered from frame to frame (fig. 10, col. 8 lines 9-25, and col. 5 lines 1-4, where the transducers are rotate around an axis to obtain the 3D images and the angles are changed in the volume data).

Regarding claim 36: A method wherein generating a three dimensional model comprises the step of filtering the data (Holupka; col. 6 lines 19-23, where filters can be used to remove noise for better display of images).

Regarding claim 37: A method wherein generating a three dimensional model comprises the step of classifying the data into separate categories (col. 4 lines 40-47, where the data are classified as 3D, orthogonal 2D, oblique 2D, and/or translucent 3D).

Regarding claim 38: A method further comprising the step of performing measurements on the data, the measurements comprising at least one of distance, surface area, volume, regions of interest, and calcification scoring (col. 7 lines 23-27, where the volume scanning is used to determine positions within the patient, the positions are read as the regions of interest).

Regarding claim 39: A method wherein generating a three dimensional model comprises the step of annotating patient and scanning information. It is well known to provide patient information and scanning information on the gathered images of X-ray, CT, and/or MRI of a patient. Examiner takes Official Notice.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

A.) Claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 19, 20, 21, 23-25, 27, 29, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holupka et al. (U.S. patent 6,256,529 B1) and Vining (U.S. patent 5,782,762).

Regarding claim 4: An imaging system further comprising a filming subsystem for transferring data onto film.

Holupka discloses to render a 3D image from obtained 2D data by stacking the 2D images and to display these images (Holupka et al.; fig. 1 elements 13-16, the display attached to the computer in fig. 1, and col. 5 lines 50-56). Holupka et al. further discloses to archive the obtained data (Holupka et al.; fig. 1 and col. 5 lines 60-62). Holupka et al. does not teach to transfer the data onto film. Vining et al. teaches to place the obtained data onto a video (Vining; fig. 3 element 30 and col. 7 lines 52-55, the video is read as the film because it is taped on a video cassette). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the reference of Vining to that of Holupka et al. because they are analogous in 3D imaging. One in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the teaching, filming the data, of Vining et al. to that of Holupka et al. so that a permanent record can be made for future viewing (Vining; col. 7 lines 53-54).

Regarding claim 5: An imaging system further comprising a networking subsystem that transfers data via a network to external devices. Holupka et al. does not teach to network to devices. Vining further teaches to network the

information to other devices or computer systems (Vining; col. 9 lines 12-25). Neither Holupka et al. nor Vining teach to network the data to external devices. Examiner takes official notice because networking to external devices is well known in the art.

Regarding claims 12 and 29: An imaging system in accordance with wherein said visualization subsystem is configured to operate in a review display mode, said review display mode comprising at least one of a playback mode and a repeat loop mode.

Holupka discloses to render a 3D image from obtained 2D data by stacking the 2D images and to display these images (Holupka et al.; fig. 1 elements 13-16, the display attached to the computer in fig. 1, and col. 5 lines 50-56). Holupka et al. further discloses to archive the obtained data (Holupka et al.; fig. 1 and col. 5 lines 60-62). Holupka et al. does not teach for the display system to contain a review display mode which is composed of a playback mode and a repeat loop mode. Vining et al. teaches to place the obtained data onto a video (Vining; fig. 3 element 30) wherein most videos contain a playback mode as well as a repeat loop mode (where the same segment of a video or the whole video is constantly played back in a loop). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the reference of Vining to that of Holupka et al. because they are analogous in 3D imaging. One in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the playback and the repeat loop mode into the system of Holupka et al. so that a user may play back the stored data as well as play it

back more than one time (repeat loop) so that the user can analyze the data until he is confident of the result.

Regarding claim 19: An imaging system wherein said visualization subsystem comprises a rendering component configured to receive data from at least one of a data acquisition system (Holupka; fig. 1 elements 13 and 14 and col. 5 lines 49-56, where the 2D images are stacked and a rendered 3D image is produced from these 2D image data which is obtained from the image processor card, the image processor card is read as the data acquisition system), a filtering component of said visualization subsystem (Holupka; col. 6 lines 19-23, where filters can be used to remove noise for better display of images), said rendering component configured to generate multiple images based on the acquired data in at least one of a real-time mode and a post-acquisition mode (Holupka; col. 4 lines 41-47 and 55-57, where 2D and/or 3D images are generated based on the data obtained and are performed in real time or after acquiring the data "post acquisition"), wherein said processor is further programmed to classify data into separate categories (Holupka et al.; col. 4 lines 40-47, where the data are classified as 3D, orthogonal 2D, oblique 2D, and/or translucent 3D).

As for the limitation of: a segmentation subsystem of said visualization subsystem.

Holupka discloses to render a 3D image from obtained 2D data by stacking the 2D images and to display these images (Holupka et al.; fig. 1 elements 13-16, the display attached to the computer in fig. 1, and col. 5 lines

50-56). Holupka et al. does not teach to segment the images to display them. Vining teaches to segment the images and display these segmented images (Vining; fig. 1 elements 70 and 80 and col. 11 lines 2-6). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the reference of Vining to that of Holupka et al. because they are analogous in 3D imaging. One in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the teaching, segmentation of images, of Vining into the system of Holupka et al. in order to segment an organ of interest/ROI from the image for study (Vining; col. 2 lines 65-67).

and wherein said processor is further programmed to operate in a volume autoview mode so that during data acquisition, a real-time, incrementally updated, three-dimensional view of the data is displayed (Holupka et al.; col. 4 lines 64-67, where the images are obtained in real time. It is inherent that these images are constantly being updated during the procedure).

said volume autoview mode can be performed in a rock mode wherein a rotation angle is applied to a 3D model, said rotation angle varying cyclically as the 3D model is rendered from frame to frame (Holupka et al.; fig. 10, col. 5 lines 1-4, and col. 8 lines 9-25, where the transducers are rotate around an axis to obtain the 3D images, examiner reads as changing or adding angles to obtain the 3D images).

Regarding claim 20: A visualization subsystem wherein to render an image, said processor is programmed to generate multiple images based on the acquired data in at least one of a real-time mode and a post-acquisition mode

(Holupka; col. 4 lines 41-47 and 55-57, where 2D and/or 3D images are generated based on the data obtained and are performed in real time or after acquiring the data "post acquisition").

Regarding claim 21: A visualization subsystem in accordance with Claim 19 wherein said processor is further programmed to apply image processing filters to the data received from the data acquisition system (Holupka; col. 6 lines 19-23, where filters can be used to remove noise for better display of images).

Regarding claim 23: A visualization subsystem in accordance with Claim 19 wherein said processor is further programmed to perform measurements on the data, said measurements comprising at least one of distance, surface area, volume, regions of interest, and calcification scoring (col. 7 lines 23-27, where the volume scanning is used to determine positions within the patient, the positions are read as the regions of interest).

Regarding claim 24: A visualization subsystem wherein the image is rendered in at least one of a real-time mode and a post-acquisition mode (Holupka; col. 4 lines 41-47 and 55-57, where 2D and/or 3D images are generated based on the data obtained and are performed in real time or after acquiring the data "post acquisition").

Regarding claim 25: A visualization subsystem wherein said processor is further programmed to annotate patient and scanning information It is well known to provide patient information and scanning information on the gathered images of X-ray, CT, and/or MRI of a patient. Examiner takes Official Notice.

Regarding claim 27: A visualization subsystem wherein said processor is further programmed to operate in a static data rendering mode and a mixed data rendering mode. Holupka et al. discloses to obtain data regular images (static mode) as well as obtain images in real time (dynamic mode) (Holupka et al.; col. 4 lines 40-47 and 64-67). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the system of Holupka where different display options of the images is available, such as displaying a static image or a mixed mode (where a static and dynamic image is displayed).

Regarding claim 34: A visualization subsystem wherein the scan data at least one of computed tomograph, magnetic resonance, and ultrasound acquired data (Holupka et al.; col. 4 lines 23-27).

B.) Claims 13-16 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holupka et al. (U.S. patent 6,256,529 B1) and Edwards et al. (U.S. patent 5,787,889).

Regarding claims 13 and 42: An imaging system wherein said visualization subsystem generates at least one volumetric model, and wherein projection of said volumetric model onto an image plane is accomplished using at least one of ray casting and texture mapping.

Holupka discloses to render a 3D image from obtained 2D data by stacking the 2D images (Holupka et al.; fig. 1 elements 13-16, the display attached to the computer in fig. 1, and col. 5 lines 50-56). Holupka et al. further

teaches to display the 3D images onto a display (Holupka et al.; fig. 1). Holupka et al. does not teach how the 3D volume image data is transformed to fit the 2D display image. Edwards et al. teaches to use ray casting to transform data from a 3D image space into 2D image space (Edwards et al.; col. 13 lines 46-51). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teaching of Edwards et al. to that of Holupka et al. because they are analogous in 3D imaging. Ray casting is a well known technique to transform data from 2D to 3D space and vice versa.

Regarding claim 14: An imaging system wherein said volumetric model is incrementally rendered (Holupka et al.; col. 4 lines 64-67, where the images are obtained in real time. It is inherent that these images are constantly being updated during the procedure).

Regarding claim 15: An imaging system wherein said volumetric model is rendered using a sliding window (Holupka et al.; col. 5 lines 43-46, where a real time window is used, i.e. the information being updated as data is gathered in real time).

Regarding claim 16: An imaging system wherein said volumetric model is defined in a hierarchical data structure (Holupka et al.; col. 5 lines 1-14, where an orthogonal or transverse slice through the 3D space is obtained).

C.) Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holupka et al. (U.S. patent 6,256,529 B1) as modified by

Vining (U.S. patent 5,782,762) and further view of Edwards et al. (U.S. patent 5,787,889).

Regarding claim 30: It is rejected for the same reason as claim 13.

Regarding claim 31: It is rejected for the same reason as claim 14.

Regarding claim 32: It is rejected for the same reason as claim 15.

Regarding claim 33: It is rejected for the same reason as claim 16.

D.) Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holupka et al. (U.S. patent 6,256,529 B1).

Regarding claim 10: A visualization subsystem wherein said processor is further programmed to operate in a static data rendering mode and a mixed data rendering mode. Holupka et al. discloses to obtain data regular images (static mode) as well as obtain images in real time (dynamic mode) (Holupka et al.; col. 4 lines 40-47 and 64-67). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the system of Holupka where different display options of the images is available, such as displaying a static image or a mixed mode (where a static and dynamic image is displayed).

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anand Bhatnagar whose telephone number is (703) 306-5914, whose supervisor is Amelia Au whose number is 703-308-6604, group fax is 703-872-9314, and Tech center 2600 customer service office number is 703-306-0377.

SAMIR AHMED
PRIMARY EXAMINER

AB

Anand Bhatnagar

Art Unit 2623

July 11, 2004